

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 15, 16, 23, 24, 29, 31, 38, 44, 53, 54, 57 and 58 have been amended as shown on pages 3-10 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on page 2 of the Reply.

Additionally Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Osberg for the teleconference of May 15, 2007. The merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 9-28, 38-41, 44-47, 49-54, 56-57 and 59-60 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-28, 38-41, 44-47, 49-54, 56-57 and 59-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gray, *et al.* (U.S. 6,674,403). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Gray, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest *each and every element* of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed subject matter comprises architecture for obtaining device locations, and generating displays representative of the location of the devices. Given that a wireless radio can return location of remote devices in 3-D space, the processing power and presentation capabilities of the current generation of computing devices can be used for presenting a 3-D representation of all devices in the area that may be of interest. To this end, independent claims 1, 31, 38, 53 and 54 recite similar features namely: *a detection component located on a first wireless device that dynamically identifies a multi-dimensional location of wireless devices of a*

network relative to the first wireless device. Gray, *et al.* does not teach or suggest such novel aspects.

Gray, *et al.* relates to performing real-time position detection and motion tracking of wireless devices via employment of a plurality of access points. The access points provide an interface between the mobile devices and a network wherein knowledge of adjacency of locales may be used to better determine the location of the mobile device as it transitions between the locales (See Abstract of Gray, *et al.*). On page 2 of the Office Action dated March 2, 2007, it is incorrectly contended that Gray, *et al.* teaches identifying wireless devices of a network relative to a new wireless device. Rather Gray, *et al.* relates to network-based position detection and tracking of a wireless mobile device such as a PDA or a laptop within a defined space (See Gray, *et al.* col. 3 lines 5-8 and 21-25). Accordingly, the system of Gray, *et al.* can specify position of a wireless device within a network relative to access points rather than another portable device within the network. Moreover, it is the access points that detect the wireless devices. In contrast, the claimed subject matter provides for detecting wireless devices on a network by a portable terminal relative to itself. For example, the subject claims facilitate a traveler who arrives at an airport lounge to detect printers, scanners, and other devices of interest and know where they are located by employing a portable terminal (See Fig.3 of applicants' specification). Such aspects are not taught or suggest by Gray, *et al.*

In view of at least the forgoing it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not taught or suggested by Gray, *et al.* Hence withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to independent claims 1, 31, 38, 53, 54 and all claims that depend there from.

II. Rejection of Claims 2, 55 and 62 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 33 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray, *et al.* in view of Miyake, *et al.* (US 2001/0042118). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Gray, *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of independent claims 1 and 54 (from which claims 2 and 20 depend). Miyake, *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Gray, *et al.*

Miyake, *et al.* relates to a system for uniformly operating and managing a network system capable of managing a plurality of types of logical networks for one network entity composed of

a plurality of objects (See Miyake, *et al.* Abstract). Nowhere does Miyake, *et al.* ***a detection component located on a first wireless device that dynamically identifies a multi-dimensional location of wireless devices of a network relative to the first wireless device*** as recited in independent claims 1 and 54. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to claims 2 and 20 that depend there from.

III. Rejection of Claims 7-8, 29-30, 42-43, 48, 58 and 61 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-8, 29-30, 42-43, 48, 58 and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray, *et al.* in view of Hollenberg (U.S. 6,091,956). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Gray, *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of independent claims 1, 38 and 54 (from which the subject claims depend). Hollenberg fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Gray, *et al.*

Hollenberg relates to a system for providing services and time-critical information about places and events to mobile computer users proximate to their current locations or potential destinations. Such information includes travel distances and transit times, entertainment, merchants' messages, area attractions, communications, current locations of system users, and traffic congestion information and user-generated information from bar-coded objects and digital photographs of scenes and other materials. (See Hollenberg Abstract). Nowhere does Miyake, *et al.* ***a detection component located on a first wireless device that dynamically identifies a multi-dimensional location of wireless devices of a network relative to the first wireless device*** as recited in independent claims 1, 38 and 54. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 31-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 31-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray in view of See Miyake, *et al.* and further in view of Hollenberg. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Gray, *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of independent claim 31. Miyake, *et al.* and Hollenberg fail to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Gray, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claim. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to claim 31 and all claims that depend there from.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP429US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731